The Principia.

First Principles in Religion, Morals, Government and the Economy of Life

Vol. II.—No. 5 NEW-YORK SATURDAY DECEMBER 1[illegible] 18[illegible]. Whole Number, 57.

The Principia

[illegible]

William Goodell, Editor.

[illegible]

[illegible]

PROSPECTUS.

[illegible]

THE BIBLE ABOLITIONIST.

[illegible]

[illegible] Scripture [illegible] for correction, [illegible]

Part II.—Of Slavery—Its Nature and Character, as Defined and Described by the Slave States themselves

CHAPTER I.

Its Cardinal Principle, Human Chattlehood, Property in Man—Workings of the Principle

What is slavery? It is the Slavery existing in America, that we are considering. Its definition is to be found in its own Code—its statutes, its judicial decisions, its characteristic usages and customs.

ITS CARDINAL PRINCIPLE—HUMAN CHATTLEHOOD

"A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs."—Louisiana Civil Code, Art. [illegible] "The slave is entirely subject to the will of his master."—*Ib.* Art. [illegible]

"Slaves shall be deemed, sold, taken, reputed and adjudged in law to be *chattels personal* in the hands of their *owners* and possessors, and their executors, administrators, and assigns, *to all intents, constructions and purposes whatsoever.*" [Law of South Carolina, 2 Brevard's Digest 229. Prince's Digest, 446, &c.]

"The cardinal principle of slavery, that the slave is not to be ranked among sentient beings but among *things*, as an article of property, a chattel personal, obtains as undoubted law in all of these States."—Stroud's Sketch, p. [illegible]

[illegible] which [illegible] by the laws of any civilized country in relation to [illegible] the words of the civil law.—[*Ib.* p. 24.]

[illegible]

[illegible]

American Slavery in the Bible? What [illegible] they have [illegible] from their Bibles concerning [illegible] the Father of all men, and the supremacy of his law? What [illegible] concerning man, his moral accountability, personality, and moral freedom? What idea can they [illegible] of a state of probation for man, if man may be held as a slave, a chattel personal, a thing, a beast, "entirely subject to the will of a master to whom he belongs?" Can anything be more certain than that "the cardinal principle" of slavery is a bold denial of all the leading truths of religion, as taught in the Bible? "All souls are mine," says Jehovah (Ezekiel 18: 4). Of every American slaveholder the pretended owner says—"Nay! but this soul is *mine*." This is the very essence of his claim, and the moment he relinquishes it, in such a form that the civil law can take cognizance of the relinquishment, that moment his claim expires, and the slave is free.

WORKINGS OF THE PRINCIPLE

The whole system of American slavery, with the legislation and jurisprudence that support it, and the usages sustained by them, grow out of the "cardinal principle" of human chattelhood already described. From that principle the entire system, in theory and practice, is deduced. Any controverted question in the Courts, is decided by referring it to that principle.

1. *Sale and mortgage of slaves.*—As a chattel personal, the slave is a subject of mortgage, barter, and sale. As a chattel he may be seized and sold at auction, for the debts of his "owner," or for the settlement of his estate, after his decease. As chattels, the slaves are transmitted by inheritance or by will, to heirs at law, or legatees. In the distribution of estates they are distributed and separated like other property like beasts, without regard to ties affinity and kindred. As property, they may be *used*, absolutely, by their owners, for their own profit or pleasure. Slave women, being chattels may be *used* either as beasts of burden, or as "breeders" of human "stock," or to gratify their master's lusts and the Slave Code affords them no protection nor redress. No public sentiment, either in the community or in the Church, mitigates this feature of the slave system.

2. *S[illegible]*—Being property themselves, they can own no property, nor make any [illegible]

[illegible]—Being held as property, and incapable of making any contract, they cannot [illegible] any marriage recognized by law.

[illegible] they can have no claim to such [illegible] the relations of husband and wife, parent and child, [illegible] from separation by sale; no marital rights, no parental rights, no family culture, no family government, no family [illegible], no family education, no family protection, no family [illegible]. If marriage and the family relation be [illegible], then slavery is at war with [illegible]. If marriage and the family relations are of God, if they are institutions of the Bible, then slavery is an institution of Satan, in opposition to the Bible.

4. *Labor without wages.*—The [illegible] the relation of [illegible] chattel [illegible] with the Heaven-established relation of labor and wages. The slave can [illegible] wages [illegible] contract, and all [illegible] himself, and all that he earns [illegible] belongs not to himself, but to his owner. If the owner should promise him wages, the promise would not be held to be legally binding. Should the stipulated sum be paid [illegible] of the slave, he would not be the possessor. [illegible]

[illegible]

—[illegible] rights in things, real or personal; but whatever they may acquire belongs [illegible] Stroud's Sketch, p. [illegible] contract.—[*Ib.* [illegible] 61.] [illegible] (Civil Code, Art. [illegible])

Now compare this with the Bible. "The [illegible] worthy of his hire" (Luke 10: 7). [illegible] his neighbor's service without wages, and giveth him not for his work" (Jer. 22: 13). "And I will come near to you to judgment, and I will be a swift witness against the sorcerers, and against the adulterers, and against the false swearers, and against those that oppress the hireling in his wages, the widow, and the fatherless, and that turn aside the stranger from his right, and fear not me, saith the Lord of hosts" (Mal. 3: 5). "Go to, now, ye rich men, weep and howl for your miseries that shall come upon you." [illegible] "Behold, the hire of your laborers who have reaped down your fields, which is of you kept back by fraud, crieth: and the cries of them which have reaped are entered into the ears of the Lord of Sabaoth." [James 5: 1-4.]

6. *The slave is [illegible]*—The slave, being the absolute property of the owner, is wholly in his power without any effectual restraint.

It is an inflexible and universal rule of slave law, founded in one or two states upon usage, in others sanctioned by express *legislation*, that the testimony of a colored person, whether bond or free, cannot be received against a white person."—[Stroud's Sketch, p. 27.]

It follows that, in the absence of a white witness, any outrage may, with impunity, be perpetrated upon a slave.

"The master is not liable to an indictment for a battery committed upon a slave."—[Wheeler's Law of Slavery, p. 244.]

In the case of "The State vs. Mann, Dec. [illegible], 1[illegible] (2 Devereaux's North Carolina Reports [illegible]) Judge Ruffin said:

"The question whether a cruel and unreasonable battery upon a slave, by the hirer, is indictable [illegible] That he is so liable, has never been doubted [illegible] known, has hitherto been contended. These [illegible] prosecutions of this sort. The established [illegible] of the country [illegible] portion of power [illegible] to the [illegible] differently, we [illegible] the judgment of [illegible] authority [illegible]

[illegible]

shall [illegible] Feb [illegible] and 14. [illegible] to [illegible] Ex [illegible] 42 [illegible] the [illegible] of [illegible] his sense. Ex [illegible]

The law of God, in the Bible, requires the equal and impartial protection of the persons and of the personal rights of all men, without distinction, making no difference between [illegible] and [illegible] The Bible [illegible] is the [illegible] that of the [illegible] from God [illegible] of God and of mankind.

[illegible]

NATIONAL SOVEREIGNTY.

[illegible]

The [illegible] independent [illegible] is the right of every [illegible]. [illegible] of government, it is [illegible]. If you would [illegible] despotism, [illegible] the people to a habit of [illegible] from those who [illegible]. The [illegible] popular sentiment [illegible]. No people will vote slavery [illegible] who shall be the slaves, and who the [illegible]. Slavery never was and never will be established by a free [illegible] of popular sovereignty in which all are equally [illegible] to vote, and equally liable to the consequences. He who favors slavery intends that others and not [illegible] shall be its victims. In all cases, slavery is that [illegible] of power against weakness which it is the mission of [illegible]. The Federal Constitution expresses the popular sentiment of the nation at the time of its adoption. It is just such an instrument as a people might adopt for their own common benefit and security, and not at all like one which a portion of them might devise for oppressing another portion. It is the rule by which they chose to govern and be governed, and by which they intended to keep the government in their own hands. If any of them entertained a purpose of reversing the legitimate use of government by making it support ruffianly power against weakness, that purpose was contradicted by the instrument. It is, however, sought to make the Constitution serve such a purpose. But its own language interposes a "difficulty." If it is [illegible] to mean just what it says, and all whom the sovereign people appoint to administer it, are lost to their own independent judgment of its meaning, what are the [illegible]? Hence the clumsy device of having [illegible] judges of the Supreme Court, explain the Constitution and having all the rest of the people's servants learn its meaning through them. What is the plea for this monopoly of [illegible]? A writer on the Government of the United States gives the following information—

"The important object of a Supreme Court of the United States, is that a uniform meaning or interpretation may be given to the Constitution and laws of the United States. One Court may declare a law to be Constitutional, another may declare it to be unconstitutional. In one State the [illegible] may be taken to mean one thing, in another quite another thing. But when the case comes before the Supreme Court and it is decided, such decision governs the [illegible] of all inferior courts throughout the Union."

The argument of this extract is plausible enough to [illegible] people who do not understand the necessity of watching jealously against judicial usurpation. But what [illegible] the Constitution is interpreted as [illegible] be it ad[illegible] of very lit[illegible] No material diversity [illegible] by [illegible] upon it constructions [illegible] are not [illegible] The Constitution itself would [illegible] all [illegible] to administer it according to [illegible] of justice. On the other hand [illegible] of the Supreme Court has [illegible] as to [illegible] an [illegible] court, in order that lawyers might agree in their [illegible] of it. Were [illegible] the Supreme Court [illegible] inferior courts a [illegible] of interpretation? Not the Constitution. That [illegible] authority to interpret the Constitution for [illegible] State Legislatures than for inferior courts. Jefferson [illegible] writing to a friend about a [illegible] said:

"You [illegible] pages 84 and 148, to consider the judges as the ultimate arbiters of all constitutional questions, a very dangerous doctrine indeed, and one which would place us under the despotism of an oligarchy. Our judges are as honest as other men, and not more so. They have, with others, the same passions for party, for power, and the privileges of their corps. Their maxim is [illegible] and their power the more dangerous as they are in office for life, and not responsible, as the functionaries are, to the elective control. The Constitution has erected no such single tribunal, knowing that to whatever hands confided, with the corruptions of time and party, its members would become despots. It has more wisely made all departments co-equal and co-sovereign within themselves." I. S.

* [illegible] Mr. [illegible] Conkling [illegible] April [illegible]

[illegible]

For the Principia.

MR. GIDDINGS ON NEGRO SUFFRAGE.

Mr. Giddings writes to the Ashtabula Sentinel on the question of negro suffrage:

"I have always opposed introducing into the Republican platform any doubtful issue. The right of suffrage is not a natural right. God never gave the right of suffrage or of holding office to an infant who never dreamed of voting or holding office. Yet He has given the infant and the female a right to live and we hang a man for murdering infants or females, precisely as for murdering men; we protect the negro precisely as we protect our wives, our children, ourselves, for the law of Ohio that protects my life and liberty, protect that of the negro to precisely the same extent."

Mr. Giddings claims to be a Republican, on *principle*, and professes to base his opposition to slavery on higher grounds than those which influence ordinary politicians. He can regard the question of negro suffrage in the light of a "doubtful issue," only on the ground of expediency.

Mr. Gidding's reasoning does not materially differ from that of the slaveholders. The slaveholder says, because I supply the physical wants of my slaves, and because I am bound, by law, to take care of them in sickness and old age, therefore, I have a right to hold and treat them as property, to deny to them the rights of education, manhood, marriage, and everything that makes life desirable.

Mr. Giddings says, because the laws in some of the States protect the negro in *some* of his rights, therefore, it is no crime to rob him of all those rights not secured to him by law. The granting to the negro his natural rights, purchases the privilege of justly denying to him all other rights. It is not easy to show wherein this logic of Mr. Giddings when carried to its final results, differs materially from the maxim of Henry Clay, that "what the law makes property is property." The negro is at the bottom of the well, surrounded by the cold damps of death; the theory of Mr. Giddings is, that, in order to get him raised up near to the top, where the air is more pure, where he can open his eyes to the partial light of day, and feel to some extent, the genial heat of the sun, it must be affirmed, as a dogma, that he should not be lifted *entirely* out of the well, and have his feet placed on terra firma, where he can snuff the inspiring blast, and be warmed into a vigorous life by the direct rays of the sun, or at least, that this is a "doubtful issue."

Mr. Giddings was the very man who in the Chicago Convention, very properly insisted on having engrafted into the Republican Platform, the extract from the Declaration of Independence, "that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; that to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed." Now, Mr. Giddings will admit, that the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness includes and carries with it, the right to use the means necessary to maintain and perpetuate these blessings; and he will [illegible] the right of suffrage as among the most important of these means, especially when he assents to the latter clause of this same extract, "that to secure these rights governments are instituted among men deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

It cannot be assumed that Mr. Giddings regards the question of "negro suffrage" a "doubtful issue" on the ground that a negro is not a man. Upon what principle of justice does he deny to the negro, being a native American, the right of suffrage, which he certainly accords to Irishmen, [illegible] the [illegible] from every country of the [illegible] Except Africa? All the [illegible] an American citizen after a brief probation. We are unwilling to [illegible] that Mr. Giddings has any [illegible] the [illegible] prejudice, engendered by slavery, which [illegible] a [illegible] colored American simply because he is colored.

[illegible] as to call for a great political party, the first [illegible] in whose platform is resistance to its extension into the Territories [illegible] within [illegible] the Free States, and [illegible] the colored man [illegible] his [illegible] and take from him the right of suffrage [illegible] evil, is at [illegible] only a "doubtful issue." [illegible] African in the free States is more wicked and [illegible] than in the slave States, and most wicked of all in the case of [illegible] philanthropists. How can Mr. Giddings [illegible] the slaveholder [illegible] makes the [illegible] in [illegible] the [illegible], while he, Mr. G., regards the negro suffrage as a doubtful issue? He that is unjust in the least is also unjust in much. M. W. [illegible]

REMARKS.—Our correspondent's argument for negro suffrage, is a conclusive one. But when Mr. Giddings comes to read the allusion to his "claims" of being a "Republican on principle," we can imagine him claiming that the Republican party is, par excellence, the "*white* man's party," so that *color* is an essential principle of his party. Again: Mr. Giddings, insisting on the incorporation into the platform of the Republican party, of the extract quoted from the Declaration of Independence, was no more inconsistent with his language concerning negro suffrage, than with the promise in that platform, not to interfere with slavery in the States. To expect or to ask *consistency* of one who could adopt that platform, and vote for a Presidential candidate pledged to slave catching, was asking too much we fear, for Mr. Giddings to concede. Our correspondent's article we hope, will do good, in more ways than one.

DR. CHEEVER'S "BRITISH AID MISSION" FOR THE CHURCH OF THE PURITANS—WHAT IS THOUGHT OF IT IN GREAT BRITAIN.

We continue our extracts from the *Glasgow Examiner*. Last week we gave the sentiments of the speakers at the great meeting in Glasgow. We now add the *editorials* of the *Examiner*.

DR. CHEEVER'S RECEPTION AND PROGRESS IN GLASGOW.

This esteemed author and preacher has reason to be satisfied with the reception he has met with in Glasgow. Not only at the public meeting on Wednesday, but everywhere has he been most cordially received, and the resolutions of the committees of the New Association for the Abolition of Slavery passed by a full meeting on Thursday, must be exceedingly satisfactory to him. In New York he can scarcely utter his uncompromising testimony without raising a nest of hornets about his ears; and their half-dozen sympathisers in Glasgow would fain grumble, but must feel it rather a hopeless endeavor. The speech of the Doctor on Wednesday evening was a great success, both as a literary effort, and as a thorough exposure of slavery and its abettors. The audience felt a deeper horror of the whole system of slavery than ever and more surprise that such a system should have the sanction of the churches and clergy of nearly all denominations in the United States. All we have seen, have expressed their determination to support Dr. Cheever [illegible] by their sympathy and money. The preaching of the Doctor excited a wide interest in his behalf. His sermon in the forenoon was one of the most powerful and pathetic ever delivered in this city, and his statement in the evening aroused the great congregation against American slavery and its protectors. It will be observed that on Sabbath [illegible] he is to occupy the pulpit of the Rev. Dr. [illegible] (Free College Church) in the forenoon, and the pulpit of the Rev. Mr. Calderwood [illegible] U. P. [illegible] the evening, and on Tuesday [illegible] he is to address a meeting in the Merchants' Hall. All who have [illegible] the Doctor [illegible] at [illegible] and dignified appearance. According to [illegible], he is an [illegible] passionate [illegible] but he [illegible] one of the most [illegible] and graceful speakers of his time. The [illegible] appearance and oratory [illegible] legations, as this is a matter in which one's senses [illegible] his maligners. We hope the Doctor will arrange with some of our eminent publishers to bring out a fresh edition of some of his charming [illegible] as many would now read that never heard of them before. It is well that when he's losing friends in New York he is gaining friends elsewhere. He feelingly alluded to one formerly his intimate friend, [illegible] the Henry Ward Beecher, who now [illegible] [illegible] This is just what was stated on the [illegible] in [illegible] last, which w

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] tion of slavery.

The views of Dr. Cheever [illegible] towards the poor slave, slavery would have been abolished long ago, and the means adopted by John Brown and others would never have been resorted. Dr. Cheever is the [illegible] in all America, and his [illegible] tions of slavery, as [illegible] in the City Hall, are quite enough to provoke the hostility with which he is so bitterly assailed. He takes his stand on the Bible—on the inalienable rights of man, and [illegible] slaveholders [illegible], whatever may be their position in Church and State. Even in his own congregation he has had to struggle with [illegible]. He seems to have in his church very unscrupulous men who adopt very mean expedients to harass him, and the pity is that in this country there should be found men mean enough and silly enough to aid and abet these parties, because such may forward their mercantile interests. Probably there never has been anything published more disgracefully impudent than the protest of these men—a protest that is its own best answer—that contradicts itself in every paragraph—a protest which any man of ordinary sagacity will see to be the work of unscrupulous malice and ignorant assumption. Dr. Cheever is far more than a match for them, in every respect. Even were his [illegible] bad as theirs, he has intellectual ability to make the worse appear the better reason. But the position of the Doctor is so simple and intelligible that it needs no sophistry to defend it. He is persecuted because he denounces American slavery, and demands that the Christian Church at [illegible] purge itself from all connection with slaveholders and their abettors. He refused to admit any mitigation or palliation in the [illegible] of any American slaveholders, but declares them all man-stealers, and ranked in the Holy Book with [illegible] and man [illegible]. "Not so fast," say his brethren in the ministry—"Not so fast," say the American papers—American slavery is not slavery at all—it is merely a domestic institution perpetuated for the good of the slave, and for the preservation of order and good morals. [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] The only charge that can be brought against him is that [illegible] his labors are calculated to produce [illegible] on which there should be no peace till the chains of the bondmen are [illegible] and the oppressed go free. The [illegible] of Dr. Cheever on this occasion, was in all respects [illegible]. He showed that on one point alone, that of separating children from their parents, and [illegible] from their wives, the system was altogether inhuman as well as [illegible], and that no considerations of state policy, or any amount of theological perversion, or metaphysical sophistry, could make it anything else. There is only one way in which the system can be honestly advocated [illegible] and that is in the way of the slaveholder's pecuniary interests. The abolition of slavery involves the sacrifice of much valuable property, and property in the eyes of the slaveholders is much more sacred than human life, human liberty, or even the principles of christianity.

GARIBALDI THE VICTOR.

Every body can praise Garibaldi, now that he is victorious. Had he failed of success, who would have given him credit for the noble qualities he exhibited? Look at the following:

The Africa brings us news of one of the most remarkable events in history. It can be told in a very few words. A man who, a few years ago, was making candles on Staten Island [illegible] has rescued a kingdom and a dependent island from a tyrannous dynasty [illegible] of half Italy [illegible] as quietly as if he were turning his back upon a day's labor.

There is a simple grandeur about the manner in which [illegible]

[illegible]

RESULTS OF WEST INDIA EMANCIPATION.

A Deputation was lately sent to the West Indies, by the [illegible] Missionary Society [illegible] The [illegible] the state of things in Jamaica.

[illegible] throughout the world."

As to the religious condition of the churches and people, they report:—

"It was not possible to [illegible] the extent and influence of religious [illegible] the native [illegible]. Judged by the [illegible] ship, visible on the mountain slopes [illegible] towns and settlements of the Island, very large provision has been made for the religious wants of the people, and [illegible] gation establishes the fact, that in many [illegible] part of the population is in the habit of attending divine worship. In several localities surrounding the chapels few persons were known to be absent from the house of God. Nothing could exceed the [illegible] during divine service. The appearance of the people on the Lord's day in our chapels was generally neat. The instances of gaudy and tasteless dress were few, [illegible] two per cent. of the whole attendance." They [illegible] the following points as particularly worthy of notice: 1. The prompt, vigorous, and searching discipline [illegible] throughout all the churches. 2. The tender interest and anxiety very frequently displayed towards those who have been excluded from the fellowship of the church. 3. With the character and devotedness of the deacons and leaders we were greatly pleased. They point out many defects, but these are mainly traceable to the [illegible] in the Island. [illegible] pastors, [illegible] in very favorable terms.

The [illegible] was mainly [illegible] a native pastorate. It is now associated with [illegible] pupils of the Normal School. From the [illegible] a number of efficient native pastors [illegible] now laboring with great [illegible].

[illegible]

The Principia.

NEW YORK [illegible]

LESSONS OF HISTORY.

[illegible] well said [illegible] philosophy teaching [illegible] and comprehensive expression [illegible] history is Divine Providence [illegible] of moral causes by their [illegible] history." Man too, is in his[illegible] "know God" or "study man" [illegible] known or studied, effectually, without knowing and studying the other, must study history, [illegible] with the thought uppermost in his mind, [illegible] the Omniscient Teacher him[self], who knew the end from the beginning, and who ar[ranged the] great drama of human events, for the grand pur[pose] [illegible]

Of all the shallow objections ever made to the divine inspiration of the Scriptures one of the most shallow is that which [illegible]. "A great part of the Bible is only history!" *Only* history? Just as though the historical parts of Scripture were mere lumber, that could be spared! Just as though there could be an adequate or credible divine revelation that should not embody large portions of history! For our own part, if we were about to write an argument in proof of the divine inspiration of the Scriptures, the historical portions of them should furnish one of the prominent stand-points of our observations—not so much for the mere purpose of showing the fulfilment of Scripture prophecy—a task which has been triumphantly accomplished already—as for the purpose of bringing out the lessons of super-human wisdom which are taught in that history, as taught by no other.

Alas! that the churches and the ministry have profited so little by those divine lessons that lie neglected in their Bibles, which they seem to venerate, but forget to study! Well would it have been for our now distracted country if Christian ministers had even tried to teach their flocks the uses of Bible history in directing their political activities, and thus controlling the destiny of their nation.

But it is not enough to study *Bible* history. *All* authentic history, so far as it is a trust-worthy record of facts, is the history of divine Providence, teaching the nature and tendencies of moral causes, in the effects that have been produced by them. When studied by those who have first [illegible] study Bible history in the light of Bible theology and [illegible] history becomes impregnated with the *animus*, so to speak, of Bible history, and answers tolerably well, as a substitute for an inspired continuation of it, showing that [illegible] in substance, is the thing that has been, in the [illegible] and that, in a sense, "there is no new thing [under the] sun."

M[illegible] are at work now in this country, [illegible] working, from the beginning of our nation's history, [illegible] in the same way and precisely in accordance with the same divine laws of retributive justice as [illegible] whose history, intermingled and allied with prophecy, is recorded in the Bible. To have studied [illegible] those records would have been to have [illegible] the otherwise necessary recurrence of the [illegible] that were before witnessed, and which must [illegible] likewise for the admonition and instruction of [illegible] that are to come after us. If the [illegible] [illegible] inflicted on Egypt, upon Babylon, upon [illegible], upon [illegible], upon Edom upon Israel and upon Judah, [illegible] to admonish and save our nation, then [illegible] national overthrow, or terrible punishment [illegible] ancient histories for the more im[illegible] warning of posterity who will stand nearer to [illegible].

[illegible] as well as America, is likely [illegible] her [illegible] accordingly as [illegible] shall have profited or shall have failed [illegible] by the study of God's Providential government of the Ancient Nations.

Many who are familiar with past history seem not to understand the history that is daily passing before them. One reason of this, perhaps, is that the history found in books [illegible] their own times [illegible] there, where the past connects itself with the present. Modern newspaper [illegible] has, within the last century, and especially within the last few years, supplied this defect. Those who have carefully read and remembered the contents of good newspapers for a few years past, and who still continue the thoughtful perusal of them, [illegible] discerning the signs of the times, [illegible] moral and political causes that are at work, elaborating them.

Why then need Bible history and the history of the last eighteen centuries, [illegible] wonder at the signs of civil commotion and disorganization that are even now beginning to upheave the civilized world, foreboding, if not presenting civil commotions in both hemispheres? Who having read sacred and secular history and the newspapers of the last thirty years can be at any loss for the moral causes of the agitations that are beginning to distract us, in this country?

Who that ever read the Scripture histories of Israel and Judah with the prophetic commentaries of the Hebrew prophets, can fail to see the parallel between those times and the present?

Did not the great national sin of permitting the oppression of the poor, equally with the sin of idolatry, and by the side of it, form the burden of prophetic reproof and admonition? Did not the false prophets prophecy smooth things—prophesy falsely, and the priests and princes bear rule by their means, the people loving to have it so? Did they not cry "peace, peace," when there was no peace? Did they not daub with untempered mortar, healing the wounds of the nation slightly, contenting themselves with half reforms, making compromises with Belial, and persecuting and deriding the true prophets who, in obedience to God, cried aloud, and spared not, lifting up their voice like a trumpet, showing the people of God their transgressions, and the house of Jacob their sins.

Could the old prophets rise again, would not their testimony and their rebukes be the same now that they were then? In what particular would the message need to be substantially changed? Are not the tolerated oppressions of this nation far heavier and more aggravated than were ever known in the land of Israel? Are not our idolatries of wealth as multiplied as were theirs, whether of Moloch or of Mammon. Does not the God who declares covetousness to be idolatry, discover as much idolatry, in the United States of America now, as he ever did in Israel or Judah? Are not our compromises with sin as odious and abominable in his sight, as were theirs?

How can ministers of religion, who profess to believe the Bible, and who nevertheless keep silence in respect to the great national sin of slaveholding, escape the same condemnation which God, by his holy prophets, pronounced upon false prophets of olden time?

SECESSION—COERSION.

To the Editor of the N. Y. Tribune.

[illegible] by the *Tribune*, that you are [illegible] to answer honest questions, even though they emanate from humble [illegible] I have to ask, and should be glad of an answer.

Are not the [illegible] Carolina, by a higher law than State law, citizens of the United States? Is not our National government to be used to regard and protect the rights of [illegible] any law of the State to the contrary notwithstanding? In the event of secession can the State deprive any of [illegible] of their United States citizenship, whether they will or no?

If it cannot, how [illegible] the United States government to protect [illegible] rights? Cannot [illegible] appeal [illegible] under Article IV, section 4 of the Constitution, [illegible] a Republican form of government, subject to the higher authority of the Constitution [illegible] may [illegible] enough of th[illegible] State government [illegible] would [illegible] the right [illegible] a Territorial Government? Or [illegible] [illegible] State?

Let m[illegible] another [illegible]

Should the State Governments, [illegible] or any [illegible] them [illegible] [illegible] the National Government [illegible] National [illegible] people [illegible] the [illegible]

[illegible] State [illegible] [illegible] Would it not be right [illegible] a Territorial Government? [illegible] the Constitution of the United States [illegible] amount to any [illegible] or authority [illegible] in good [illegible] Government [illegible] citizens? Very [illegible] A. L. P.

M[illegible]

[illegible]

[It is] a far easier task [illegible] them, [but] answering a few of Mr. [illegible] dispose of the list.

1. We will not undertake to [illegible] any State are citizens also of the United States [illegible] or lower than any State law. Our judgment [illegible] that State and Federal laws are each [illegible] in their proper sphere respectively, and [illegible] and in all [illegible] above the other.

2. Mr. P. [illegible] whether, if the State Governments should cease to exist, the Federal Government [illegible] therefore fall. We answer decidedly yes. If the State Governments were abolished, there could be no Constitutional election of U. S. Senators, and that would [illegible] Government. Even though but *half* the State Governments were [illegible] out this would soon deprive the Senate of a quorum, and thus render it impotent. And it would hardly be possible to maintain the Federal Government for a single year without a competent Senate.

3. As to what Congress may be [illegible] to do, we will not decide. It is far [illegible] the purpose to decide what Congress [illegible] we again avow our deliberate conviction that, whenever six or eight contiguous States shall have formally [illegible] from the Union and avowed the pretty unanimous and [illegible] resolve of their people to *stay* out, it will not be found practicable to coerce them into subjection [illegible] that any Congress can be found to direct and to provide for such coercion. One or two States may be coerced, [illegible] entire section or quarter of the Union. If you doubt, [believe] this, wait and see.—[*Ed. Trib.*

As the *Tribune* finds it inconvenient or inexpedient to meet, directly, some of the most important practical points involved in the questions of A. L. P. we propose to attempt answering them ourselves. In doing this, we may, perhaps answer some of the questions in a sense or to an extent, not in the mind of the questioner, but, to our mind, necessarily involved in them.

1. We answer. All the citizens of South Carolina are citizens of the United States, under the Federal Constitution, which is "the supreme law of the land"—"anything in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding."—Art VI clause 2 of the Constitution.

2. Our national government is to be used to regard and protect the rights of those citizens, any law of the State to the contrary notwithstanding.

3. "In the event of secession"—*such* secession as is threatened by the slaveholders, a minority of the people, the inhabitants will *not* be deprived of their right of citizenship of the United States. To say otherwise would be to deny the rights of the people of South Carolina, under the Constitution of the United States.

4. "In the event of such secession" or without it, the people of South Carolina, or any portion of them, *have a right* to claim from Congress, under Article IV section 4, of the Constitution "a Republican form of government" subject to the higher authority of the Constitution.

5. Should the State *Governments* (or the administrators thereof,) or any number of them, either abdicate Government, or commit treason against the Federal Government, it would be the right and duty of the Federal Government to provide and guarantee to the law abiding people of the State "a Republican form of government" as aforesaid, or if not sufficiently numerous, organize them into a Territory, as other Territories are organized.

But, the truth is that, properly speaking, there is no [illegible] danger that either South Carolina or [illegible] or any other slave State will secede from the Union. The *State* of South Carolina, strictly speaking, is [illegible] South Carolina [illegible] the petty oligarchy of slaveholders that in defiance of the Constitution now tyrannize over [illegible]. The [illegible] official signatories of South Carolina *secede* from [illegible] the United States Government, they [illegible] *de facto*, as a State Government [illegible] powers. In violating their official [illegible] support the Constitution of the United States, they declare [illegible] the [illegible] which [illegible] the [illegible] of the United States, including that portion of the citizens of the United States who are also citizens of South Carolina—they [illegible] adrift from them, and consequently from [illegible] South Carolina," as well as from the United States.

There never *has been* and there is not *now*, any "*State* of *South Carolina*" that has not been, and that is not, [one] of the "*United* States of America," as first declared in the Declaration of Independence, July 4, 1776. Before that Declaration there was no "State of South Carolina," and the Declaration makes her *one* of "the United States of Ameri-

[illegible] While she repudiates the [illegible] of her unity with the [illegible] [illegible] her independence of course [illegible] to be a State.

South Carolina's "Declaration of Independence" was not only a declaration of her independence [illegible] of the United States. But it was also a declaration of the inalienable rights of all men, consequently of all the men in South Carolina, and an appeal to the "Supreme Judge of the World for the rectitude of her intentions," to establish a government "for the security of these rights," a government "deriving its just powers from the consent of the governed" —[illegible] the right of "THE PEOPLE" (the whole of them) to "alter and abolish their government and to institute a new government,—whenever any form of government [illegible] destructive of these ends." So that, in seceding from the Union, South Carolina will disband her State government and begin anew with "all men" as a constituency, to help organize.

Back of all this history we find South Carolina represented in the old Continental Congress in 1774, participating in forming the "Articles of Association" of the United Colonies—no States—establishing strong powers of Congress over the Colonies, a Congress exercising the right to regulate commerce, [illegible] Non Importation Acts, and especially *interdicting the importation of slaves*. On behalf of South Carolina, these articles were signed by Henry Middleton, Thomas Lynch, Christopher Gadsden, John Rutledge, and Edward Rutledge—as many names save one as her present representation in Congress.

Every South Carolinian, black or white, bond or free, is a citizen of the United States, entitled to Federal protection, for the Federal Constitution, like the old Articles of Confederation of 1778, the Declaration of Independence, the Articles of Association, and the Gospel of the New Testament, knows nothing of race or complexion, and nothing of bond or free.

As to the bugbear of coercion, civil war, &c., all this is dispelled simply by remembering that the *slaveholders* are not *South Carolina*, that a majority of the people of South Carolina are colored, that a very large majority of the whites are non-slaveholders. A national proclamation of protection to these, as the Constitution requires, would settle the question with less difficulty or loss of blood, than it would cost to enforce a liquor prohibition bill in this city.

It is the *North*, not the *South*, that needs to be abolitionized.

THE DISCUSSIONS IN WILLIAMSBURGH, on Civil Government, at the First Congregational Church, (Rev. S. S. Jocelyn's) are to be continued on *Tuesday evenings*, at ½ past 7 o'clock.

The second question, discussed last Tuesday evening was:

"What is Civil Government—and what are its objects?"

The third question, for next Tuesday evening, is:

"On whom do the responsibilities of Civil Government rest?"

Ladies and gentlemen attend [illegible]. Admittance gratis—Seats free.

[illegible]

News of the Day.

A PICTURE OF HOME AT THE SOUTH

A young lady in South Carolina [illegible] in this city:

[illegible] S. C., Saturday, Dec. 1, 1860.

MY DEAR UNCLE: [illegible]

[illegible] to prepare to any [illegible] and the [illegible] to your [illegible] to remain here [illegible] should come to the [illegible].

You may [illegible] you [illegible] Already we [illegible] at any moment [illegible] [illegible] they [illegible] we would [illegible] field servants in their [illegible] and [illegible] valued house servants [illegible] we would trust to any extent, are watched and guarded against with all the [illegible] and care that we possess. Our planters and owners of slave property do not allow their servants to have any intercourse with each other, and the negroes are confined strictly to the premises where they belong. We are all obliged to increase our force of [illegible] to prevent the free intercourse even among our [illegible]. The negroes feel and notice these new restraints and evidently ask "Why is this?" But it is unnecessary for them to ask the question, for they all comprehend [illegible] as well as we who [illegible] them. They have already [illegible] enough to give them an idea of what is going on in the State and country, and this knowledge they have not gained from Abolitionists, as some suppose, but from the conversation of their owners indiscreetly held in their presence. They have already heard of Lincoln's election, and have heard also that he is for giving them their liberty, and you may imagine the result.

You have heard that our servants all love their masters, and their masters' families, and would lay down their lives for them—that the colored race in the South prefer Slavery to Freedom—that they would not be free if they could, &c. That is [illegible] of the case; the *reality* consists in sleeping [illegible] at night—doubly bolting and barring our doors—in establishing and maintaining an efficient patrol force—buying watch dogs, and taking turns in watching our sleeping children, to guard them and ourselves from the vengeance of those same "loving servants"—a vengeance which, though now smothering, is liable to burst out at any moment, to overwhelm the State in spite of the Palmetto flag or State precautions.

You at the North are not the only ones who are suffering financially by this new panic. The planters among us are really suffering from the depreciation in their property. Already negroes are not worth half price. No one dares buy a servant, fearing lest he in doing so should be introducing upon his plantation one tinctured with the idea of freedom.

My husband has but a few servants—I believe but thirty-one all told—still I feel (and so does he) that they are thirty-one too many in such times as these. He would sell them immediately, if it were possible, but the truth is, he could realize nothing for them at present, or at most not over half their real value. Slaves are a drug in the market, my husband says, and you know him well enough to judge of his judgment in such matters.

Now, one word as to the military [illegible] of the State, to protect us against an insurrection. I presume, with the exception of Charleston and perhaps a few larger towns, that the remainder of the State is situated very much as we are here, and I will give you an idea of how well prepared we are to resist a mob. Upon our place of about 1,200 acres we have, of white males—husband, two overseers, and my son of 18 years, total *four*; females—self and cousin, little Lucy and one of the [illegible] has a wife—four; of whom only four at the most are capable of bearing arms—to effect which we have at least seventeen field hands—sturdy young negroes—beside the female servants. And this is a fair representation of the [illegible] of our plantations. Considering such a state of [illegible] blame me for desiring to absent myself, my husband, and children, from the State?

THE QUESTION OF SECESSION—OFFICIAL VIEW OF THE CASE—OPINION OF ATTORNEY GENERAL BLACK.

We have no room for the entire letter, but [illegible] of the [illegible] points, in the following extracts. The Letter is addressed to "The President of the United States," and commences thus:

ATTORNEY GENERAL'S OFFICE,
November 20, 1860.

SIR: I have had the honor to receive your note of [illegible], and I now reply to the [illegible] as fully as the time allowed me will permit.

Within their respective spheres of action the federal government and the government of a State are both [illegible] [illegible]

[illegible] the jurisdiction of a State, because the laws of the U. S. are common and binding only so far as they are passed in pursuance of the constitution. I do not say what might be effected by mere revolutionary force. I am speaking of legal and constitutional rights.

After citing authorities in support of his opinion, Mr Black proceeds:—

To the Chief Executive Magistrate of the Union is confided the solemn duty of seeing the laws faithfully executed. That he may be able to meet this duty with a power equal to its performance, he nominates his own subordinates and removes them at his pleasure. For the same reason the land and naval forces are under his orders as their commander-in-chief. But his power is to be used only in the manner prescribed by the legislative department. He cannot accomplish a legal purpose by illegal means, or break the laws himself to prevent them from being violated by others.

The law requires that all goods imported into the United States within certain collection districts shall be entered at the proper port, and the duty thereon shall be received by the collector appointed for, and residing at that port. But the functions of the collector may be exercised anywhere at or within the port. There is no law which confines him to the custom house, or to any other particular spot. If the custom-house were burnt down, he might remove to another building; *if he were driven from the shore he might go on board a vessel in the harbor. If he keeps within the port he is within the law.*

A port is a place at which merchandise is imported, and from whence it is exported. It is created by law. It is not merely a harbor or haven, for it may be established where there is nothing but an open roadstead, or on the shore of a navigable river, or at any other place where vessels may arrive and discharge or take in their cargoes. It comprehends the city or town which is occupied by the mariners, merchants, and others who are engaged in the business of importing and exporting goods, navigating the ships and furnishing them with provisions. It includes also so much of the water adjacent to the city as is usually occupied by vessels discharging or receiving their cargoes or lying at anchor and waiting for that purpose.

Mr Black relates how the Act of March 1833 authorized the President, "in a certain contingency to direct that the customs be collected at any secure place *within some port or harbor of such district,*" &c. But that Act has expired. The President, however, he says, has the power to collect the duties *within the harbor* of any port of entry, whether in a vessel or on shore—the harbor of Charleston for example. The Letter proceeds:

Your right to take such measures as may seem to be necessary for the protection of the public property is very clear. It results from the proprietary rights of the government as owner of the forts, arsenals, magazines, dock-yards, navy-yards, custom-houses, public ships and other property which the United States have bought, built and paid for. Besides, the government of the United States is authorised by the constitution (art. 1, sec. 8) to "exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever over all places purchased by the consent of the legislature of the state in which the same shall be for the erection of forts, magazines, arsenals, dock-yards, and other needful buildings." It is believed that no important public building has been bought or erected on ground where the legislature of the State in which it is has not passed a law consenting to the purchase of it and ceding the exclusive jurisdiction. This government then is not only the owner of those buildings and grounds, but, by virtue of the supreme and paramount law, it regulates the action and punishes the offences of all who are within them. If any one of an owner's rights is plainer than another it is that of keeping exclusive possession and repelling intrusion. The right of defending the public property includes also the right of recapture after it has been unlawfully taken by another. President Jefferson held the opinion, and acted upon it, that he could order a military force to take possession of any land to which the United States had title, though they had never occupied it before, though a private party claimed and held it, and though it was not then needed nor proposed to be used for any purpose connected with the operations of the government. This may have been a stretch of Executive power, but the right of retaking public property in which the government has been carrying on its lawful business, and from which its officers have been unlawfully thrust out, cannot well be doubted; and when it was exercised at Harper's Ferry, in October, 1859, every one acknowledged the legal justice of it.

I come now to the point in your letter which is probably of the greatest practical importance. By the act of 1807 you may employ such parts of the land and naval forces as you may judge necessary for the purpose of causing the laws to be duly executed, in all cases where it is lawful to use the militia for the same purpose. By the act of 1795 the militia may be called forth "whenever the laws of the United States shall be opposed or the execution thereof obstructed in any state by combinations too powerful to be suppressed by the ordinary course of judicial proceedings, or by the powers vested in the marshals." This imposes

[illegible] the President [illegible] whether an exigency has arisen which [illegible] military force, and in proportion to the [illegible] responsibility will be his care not to [illegible] his legal and just authority.

[illegible] which are administered by the [illegible] and exercised by the [illegible] officers of the courts [illegible] and [illegible] the United States [illegible] under the federal constitution [illegible] [illegible]

[illegible] ... they are [illegible] the latter than the former can act at all.

But what if the feeling in any State against the United States should become so universal that the Federal officers themselves (including Judges, district attorneys, and marshals) would be reached by the same influences, and resign their places? Of course, the first step would be to appoint others in their stead, if others could be got to serve. But in such an event, it is more than probable that great difficulty would be found in filling the offices. We can easily conceive how it might become altogether impossible. We are therefore obliged to consider what can be done in case we have no courts to issue judiciary process, and no ministerial officers to execute it. In that event troops would certainly be out of place, and their use wholly illegal. If they are sent to aid the courts and marshals, there must be courts and marshals to be aided. Without the exercise of those functions, which belong exclusively to the civil service, the laws cannot be executed in any event, no matter what may be the physical strength which the government has at its command. Under such circumstances, to send a military force into any State with orders to act against the people, would be simply making war upon them.

The existing laws put and keep the federal government strictly on the defensive. You can use force only to repel an assault on the public property, and aid the courts in the performances of their duty. If the means given you to collect the revenue and execute the other laws, be insufficient for that purpose, Congress may extend and make them more effectual toward that end.

If one of the States should declare her independence, your action cannot depend upon the rightfulness of the cause upon which such declaration is based. Whether the retirement of a State from the Union, be the exercise of a right reserved in the constitution, or a revolutionary movement, *it is certain that you have not in either case the authority to recognize her independence, or to absolve her from her federal obligations.* Congress, or the other States in Convention assembled, must take such measures as may be necessary and proper. In such an event, I see no course for you but to go straight onward in the path you have hitherto trodden—that is, execute the laws to the extent of the defensive means placed in your hands *and act generally upon the assumption that the present constitutional relations between the States and the federal government continue to exist, until a new order of things shall be established, either by law or force.*

Mr. Black proceeds to discuss the question "whether Congress has a right to make war upon one or more states, and require the Executive to carry it on, by means of force to be drawn from the other states." He comes to the conclusion that Congress has no such power.

[How well this agrees with the former parts of his Letter is a question deserving of consideration.]

The letter closes as follows

If this view of the subject be correct, as I think it is, then the Union must utterly perish at the moment when Congress shall arm one part of the people against another for any purpose beyond that of merely protecting the general government in the exercise of its proper constitutional functions.

I am very respectfully yours, &c., J. S. Black.

To the President of the United States.

The N. Y. Evening Post, in reviewing the above letter, says:

[illegible] and the [illegible] government. [illegible]

[illegible] the theory of [illegible] He [illegible] a State [illegible] [illegible] Mr. Black [illegible] [illegible] a State [illegible]

Common [illegible] the [illegible] of a state as official and [illegible] laws against [illegible] President Washington, when, in the whiskey war of Pennsylvania in which several counties were joined in resistance to the imposition of excise duties, he called for the troops of other states to assist the governmental agents, did not suppose he was coercing Pennsylvania. He merely enabled the regular authorities of the general government to do the duties imposed upon them by the law, and by their office.

A resort to this extreme kind, however, is not needed in the treatment of South Carolina. Mr. Black has shown an equally effective and far more peaceable method.

The Post here recites from Mr. Black's letter, the paragraph affirming the right of the President to collect the duties from on board a public vessel, in the harbor, and then says further:

A national vessel stationed at Fort Moultrie, to see the customs properly collected, would be all that is necessary. Should the South Carolina authorities attempt to interfere with her, they would be making war upon the United States, not the United States making war upon them.

The Post next remarks that Congress, which *made* Charleston a port of entry, might suspend or repeal that portion of the act which made her one.

No vessel could sail from there, because no such vessel would have a manifest and a clearance which other nations would recognize. No vessel from abroad would enter there, because there would be no means of perfecting an entry, and neither owner nor captain would take upon himself the hazards of a probable confiscation. South Carolina is not herself known as a sovereign nation by any of the mercantile powers, nor could she get herself recognized for a long time to come, particularly without the consent of the United States. A manifest issued by her would have no more effect, in the tribunal of the world, than a manifest signed here by a few persons in Chatham street. It would be no protection to cargo or crew, the one of which would be contraband, and the other piratical.

Here, then, we have a peaceful antidote for that "peaceful remedy" which is called secession. It is no act of war, nor hostility, to revoke the permission given to any town to be a port of entry; but when that permission is revoked, it would be an act of hostility either on the part of our own citizens, or of foreigners, to disregard the injunction.

Between Mr. Black, and the Evening Post, the President and the President elect might find a quiet way of managing South Carolina.—Editor.

JOHN M. BOTTS ON SECESSION.

Now that the subject of secession is under discussion, it is well to notice and record the various views of prominent men, Northern and Southern, on the subject. The letter of Mr Botts is among the most remarkable of them.

On one point we must strongly protest against his course of argument. He thinks to stave off secession by procuring a repeal of Northern Personal Liberty bills, or by other concessions to slavery. He is [illegible] to [illegible] whatever the [illegible] may be.

LETTER FROM HON JOHN M. BOTTS.

[illegible] Nov. 17, 1860.

My [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] but [illegible] and [illegible] it was only [illegible] of our Saviour [illegible]

I [illegible] that [illegible]

[illegible]

If I understand my [illegible] Mr. Pryor, the election of a Black Republican President would be an issue for disunion. I understood my learned [illegible] Mr. Hilliard, to say that upon that issue he would be ready to dissolve the Union. I say with all deference to my colleagues here that no more unfair issue could be tendered to the South upon which we should dissolve the Union, than the loss of an election. When I am asked to raise the flag of revolution against an election under the forms of the law and the Constitution, I am asked to do an unconstitutional thing, according to the Constitution, as it now exists. I am asked to put myself in the position of a rebel, of a traitor, in a position where, if the Government should succeed, and put down the revolution, I and my friends could be arraigned before the Supreme Court of the United States, and there be sentenced to be hanged for violating the Constitution and laws of the country.

Such is the admission of the leader whom you propose to follow and you made an earnest appeal to me to unite with you in assuming the position of a rebel and a traitor, for which I may be sentenced to be hanged for violating the Constitution and laws of my country. Pardon me, my respected, but impetuous friend, but I had rather not. I am impelled by every consideration of honor and duty to decline your very polite invitation.

Do you doubt, or does any sensible and reflecting man doubt, that Mr. Yancey described truly the situation which every man occupies who favors the movement of South Carolina, because of the election of Mr. Lincoln? for even she does not pretend, that she would have occupied her present position if Lincoln had been defeated, and yet, are you not surprised to see so many of our own people turning rebels and traitors at her bidding? are you not indeed surprised yourself? Rebel and traitor! very imposing and high sounding designations in the estimation of some, perhaps, but I have no particular desire that they should attach to my name—either now, or in after life. My aspirations do not run in that line.

South Carolina, spurning the counsels and co-operation of Virginia, and other Southern States, has, of her own accord, and upon her own hook, chosen to raise a mighty and a fearful issue with the general government and upon the general government rests the responsibility of settling the question. Hands off, and fair play to both say I. In its present stage we have nothing to do with it, and so far as I am concerned, I turn her over to "Uncle Sam," and if she can maintain her position against that respectable and powerful old gentleman, let her have all the honor and glory, and benefit of the achievement herself. I hope she may have a good and a merry time of it. She will be a State of the Union in a state of rebellion, and I have not a shadow of doubt, either of the right or the power to control her. The only question would be—Is it worth while? Would it not be better to let her go out and stay out until she had made the experiment, and like the prodigal, return to her home to eat up the fatted calf.

But that unfortunately would lead to another perplexing difficulty which is, that it would amount to an acknowledgment that we have no government, and never had one, that our fathers were a set of old fools and fogies, who thought they were making for their posterity a government that would endure for ever, while it was nothing more than a voluntary association of States to be tolerated only so long as it was entirely agreeable [illegible] it became irksome to any one State [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

It is very true that the government was not made by force, and it is for that very reason that there is no right to break it up and that it can be kept together by force; whether that is a [illegible] it is altogether a different question. If it had been formed by force, [illegible] a government [illegible] the people which had never [illegible] their approval [illegible] that any of the parties would be [illegible] throwing it off whenever they could get rid of it. But it [illegible] was not [illegible] force, but that, on the other hand, it was a free and voluntary compact, entered into [illegible] with another, and each [illegible] with all the rest, that there is a power to [illegible] the compact.

[illegible] are not and cannot be created by force, but if voluntarily entered into, the payment of the obligation may be enforced by the strong arm of the law; and the compact between the States having been voluntarily entered [illegible] may [illegible] like manner be [illegible] if [illegible] by the strong arm of the government, and it [illegible] government at all [illegible] is not [illegible] sufficient force to protect [illegible] against treason and [illegible] on the part of its own [illegible]. [illegible] a government [illegible] was [illegible] with the power [illegible] for calling forth [illegible] to execute the laws of the Union, suppress insurrection, and repel invasions, whether they [illegible] or without? Pshaw! that's an [illegible] It was a government of force, and very [illegible] in [illegible] when the force [illegible] passed a Democratic Congress [illegible] House by a vote of 149 to 45, and in the Senate by [illegible] that [illegible] have [illegible] of late [illegible] of secession, and it [illegible] that [illegible] impossibility of ever forming a fixed, permanent [illegible] government out of two or more States; for if our [illegible] does not make the a permanent government as [illegible], the language cannot be employed that would [illegible] our institutions are no better than those of Mexico.

[illegible] were to be formed, I could not go with you, [illegible] whatever influence I [illegible] be able to exert against [illegible] with South Carolina, that has played the part of [illegible] brawler and disturber of the public peace for the last [illegible] years, and who [illegible] give no security that I would be [illegible] that she would not be as faithless to the next [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] path of duty and honor by the ten thousand mis-representations that are scattered broadcast over the country for the purpose of [illegible] popular passion.

It takes a great while to build up a government, and it will require a vast deal of sober reflection, foresight, knowledge, wisdom, and experience to form one that will prove a satisfactory substitute for this which you propose to discard.

If you feel [illegible] that the State [illegible] prepared at a moment's notice to bring all these various and essential elements to bear upon this subject [illegible] you are I am not; and as there is less danger to be apprehended from cautious deliberation, than from impetuous haste, I beg you to unite with me in urging the people of Virginia not to be in too great a hurry to destroy, or hazard the loss of, what all the world will never be able to give them again.

I am respectfully, your obedient servant and friend.

J. M. BOTTS.

T. H. B. M., esq., of staunton, Va.

CONGRESS

From the Times of Tuesday.

The session of Congress, yesterday, was attended with far less excitement than we were led to anticipate, from the tenor of our dispatches of Sunday night. The discussions upon all topics connected with the subject of secession, were conducted with calmness, and altogether a decidedly better feeling was exhibited on every side. In the Senate, the Standing Committee of the last session were continued; Mr. Latham's resolution relative to the overland mail was referred to the committee on Post offices and Post roads; a memorial from Thaddeus Hyatt, presented by Mr Sumner, relative to the suffering people of Kansas, was referred to the Committee on Territories; and the Homestead bill was read for the first time. Mr Powell, of Kentucky, then called up his resolution, presented on Thursday, relative to the present condition of the country, and made a few remarks expressive of his views. Mr. Collamer, of Vermont, made a motion, which was agreed to by Mr Powell, to strike out everything from the resolution excepting that which referred to federal affairs, and that it be referred to a Special Committee. During a discussion which intervened, Mr. Latham of California, said that his State would remain with the Union under all circumstances—intimating that she could otherwise never secure that great desideratum a Pacific Railroad. Mr Foster of [illegible], said the management of the country for the present was with the Democrats but he would support the resolution. Mr Douglas hoped that there would be no more talk of party until the grave question was settled. Mr. Davis, of Mississippi, did not regard the proposition as [illegible] a good result. Several other speeches were made on the subject, among which was one by Mr. Dixon of Connecticut, who [illegible] the idea that it is impossible for the two systems of free and slave labor to exist in the confederacy, and the Senate adjourned at a late hour. In the House, Mr. Hawkins of Florida proceeded [illegible] additional reasons for asking to be excused from serving on the Special Committee on the [illegible] [illegible] He [illegible] a warning that Mississippi, Alabama, Florida, Georgia and South Carolina were [illegible] to be followed by Arkansas, Louisiana and Texas. The loss of his [illegible], however, was rather more [illegible] than was expected. Mr. Vallandigham of Ohio, in a rather [illegible] speech, argued in favor of excusing Mr. Hawkins. Mr. McClernand of Illinois, was unwilling to excuse him. Mr. [illegible], of New York, believed that the [illegible] with the [illegible] Republican Party, and declared that the [illegible] of the Northern States might be [illegible] in order that they might [illegible]. The [illegible] Mr. [illegible] [illegible] from the Committee of Ways and Means, of a bill authorizing the issue of ten millions in Treasury notes, for the [illegible] of the Government. The [illegible] passed after a brief debate, and the House adjourned.

[illegible] of Wednesday.

The debate on the question of secession, commenced in Congress on Monday, was continued yesterday in both Houses and occupied the attention of the Senate until late in the afternoon. Although the discussion was animated, the temper of Senators was good—the most violent demonstration being from Mr. Iverson of Georgia, the tone of whose remarks was generally deprecated. Before the debate commenced, the House Treasury Note and Loan bill, was referred to the Committee on Finance; and subsequently, on motion of Mr. Hale, the Committee on Military Affairs was instructed to inquire whether the expense of the army cannot be reduced without detriment. The resolution of Mr. Powell, of Kentucky, was then taken up, and Mr. Bigler of Pennsylvania, proceeded to give his views in reference to secession. He announced himself a thorough Union man, and declared himself ready, like Mr. Douglas, to go with men of every party who will devote themselves to the work of rescuing the country from impending danger. Mr. Iverson declared that the South did not fear the operation of the Personal Liberty bills, nor care for the operation of the Fugitive Slave law. If she were left to herself, the slave population would increase in thirty years from four and a half to thirty millions; and if, on the contrary, the North prevailed, universal emancipation would eventually take place. The debate was participated in by Messrs. Pugh, of Ohio, Ten Eyck, of New Jersey, Green, of Missouri, Douglas, of Illinois, Fitch, of Indiana, Powell, of Kentucky, Wade, of Ohio, Davis, of Mississippi, Mason, of Virginia, Collamer, of Vermont, Brown, of Mississippi, Iverson, of Georgia, and Wigfall, of Texas,—the prominent point being the violations of the Fugitive Slave law. Mr Douglas combated the idea that because the rights of the [illegible] States had been violated, they were justified in breaking up the Union. In the House, business was confined principally to the consideration of the construction of the Select Committee on the perilous condition of the Union, and the results to be effected by it. Mr Cobb, of Alabama, announced himself as a Union man, and desired that the Committee should commence its labors as soon as possible, as immediate action became necessary, in view of the fact that the Convention called in his State, would meet on the 7th of January. Mr. Davis, of Mississippi declared his intention to serve on the Committee. He had entertained an opinion that the Southern members should withdraw, and leave the Republicans to submit a report, but his views had undergone a modification. The House, 101 to 95, then refused to excuse Mr Hawkins, of Florida, when that gentleman [illegible] to serve. Mr. Boyce of South Carolina, then asked to be excused, and objection being made by Mr [illegible] of Virginia, [illegible] debate [illegible]. Mr Smith expressed surprise that the Republicans had thus far declined to participate in the discussion. It was intimated in rejoinder that the Republicans did not refuse to discuss the questions in [illegible] that the proper time for discussion would be after the Committee had made a report. The House did not [illegible] a vote on the [illegible] of excusing Mr Boyce. Mr. Sherman reported, from the Committee of Ways and Means, the Pensions and Consular Appropriation bill and one for the support of the Indian Department. The petition of Thaddeus Hyatt, relative to the sufferers in Kansas was also introduced, and referred to the Committee on Territories. To-day the States will be called in regular order for bills and resolutions and those relative to the [illegible] of the Union will go to the Select Committee.

The Wesleyan Methodist Church, of the [illegible] have [illegible] [illegible] St. [illegible] Avenue, in a beautiful [illegible], [illegible] fitted up for the [illegible] [illegible] of the [illegible] and West of the Avenue [illegible] S. A. Baker [illegible] will be preaching every Sabbath at 10½ A.M. and 7 P.M. [illegible] through the week. The [illegible] will be [illegible]ted. [illegible] Anti-Slavery and [illegible] people, in a word all Christians are invited to come [illegible] build up a pure [illegible] and spread a pure Gospel.

Family Miscellany.

SABBATH IN THE COUNTRY.

[illegible]

Upon the white-washed Sunday school
[illegible] between the poplars [illegible]
[illegible] their shadows cool
[illegible] upon the dusty [illegible]
You hear the Sabbath hymn.

From farm and field, and grange grown gray,
From woodland walks and winding ways,
The old and young, the grave and gay,
Unto the [illegible] come to pray,
And sing God's holy praise.

[From Life Illustrated.]

YIELD NOT TO DARK DESPAIR.

Hast thou one heart that loves thee,
In this dark world of care,
Whose gentle smile approves thee?
Yield not to dark despair.

One hand whose loving fingers
Are pressed in thine alone,
One fond, confiding bosom,
Whose thoughts are all thine own?

One truthful voice to guide thee,
And bless thee in distress;
One breast when thou art weary,
Whereon thy head to rest?

Till death thy form have shrouded,
And [illegible] that heart so warm,
Till death the earth have clouded,
Heed not the passing storm.

Thou hast [illegible] tie to bind thee,
And [illegible] rare
[illegible] sweet love entwine thee,
In this dark world of care.

[illegible] Wis. DARK SYBIL.

MODERN MARTYRDOM.

BY MRS. GEORGE WASHINGTON WYLLYS.

The ancient worthies that we read about were in the habit of making a very great parade on the subject of their sacrifices to friendship. Damon and Pythias, Antonio and Bassanio, and half a dozen *others* that we could mention, if we only had time to think of their many-syllabled names, have got up a very brilliant reputation on that score; now, why don't somebody chronicle the sufferings and endurances that we of the nineteenth century go through with, in the very same cause? The recital wouldn't probably be so romantic, but then it would be piercingly *real!*

"Remember, you are to come and take tea with me to-morrow evening."

Shades of dyspepsia—omens of uncomfortable dreams—feel certainly of pains under our belt-ribbons! what *do* people want to evince their desire of honoring you in this barbaric manner, for? And there is no creditable way of backing out of the dilemma: you can only smile a sickly assent, and submit. As ladies haven't the privilege of swearing, that mild remedy which so often mitigates the sufferings of their better halves is as a sealed book to them, and they endure in meek silence!

We would like to ask, what is the use of these stale banquets? Why won't some brave reformer uproot them from the face of the land? What have women, in the abstract done, that when they go visiting anywhere, particularly in the rural districts, they should be immolated on the shrine of eating and drinking? Do people suppose that their honored guests live in a perpetual state of [illegible] at home? [illegible]

[illegible]

And [illegible] she may have the triumph of [illegible] kind of cake on her board than Mrs [illegible], whose you took tea [illegible] trumpet. Of [illegible] pity on your digestive [illegible] her calculations at all. Three or four varieties of expensive jellies and sickeningly rich [illegible]—[illegible], and tea strong enough [illegible] of cake than you had [illegible] anywhere [illegible] the Complete Cookery-Book—[illegible] the fervid glow of an August [illegible] at its head, who will be mortally offended if [illegible] everything that is set before you!

Damon and Pythias were great friends—but if anything could have [illegible] it would have been Damon's [illegible]. Pythias [illegible] Damon was very willing to die on the scaffold—[illegible] a short and easy way out of the world—[illegible] whether ever he would have [illegible] with weapons of pound-cake and strawberry jelly!

Dear women! you are always ready to listen to suggestions from one of your own band—do be sensible and give up this half-savage custom of entertaining your guest's stomaches instead of their brains! Let those come into your midst without being made uncomfortable by needless show and parade. It is only reasonable to suppose that they wish to enjoy your society instead of admiring your china and devouring dyspeptic sweets. Give them the benefit of the doubt, for mercy's sake! How often we have pitied your disappointment when, after having proclaimed the shining intellect and charming conversation of Mrs. Somebody to all your friends, you found her silent and uninteresting when the "showing-off" time came—you couldn't tell why; *we* can. Why, Madame de Stael herself couldn't have said a word, after passing through the ordeal of a New England tea-drinking!

Will you think over this matter, ladies? will you spare yourself and your friends these well-meant miseries? If not we humbly trust that you will never ask us, or any one in whom we have an interest, to "come to tea!" We had rather come to a dentist's chair, or a sewing society, or a Woman's Right's Convention, any time!

THE BOY THE FATHER OF THE MAN.

Solomon said, many centuries ago, "Even a child is known by his doings, whether his work be pure and whether it be right."

Some people seem to think that children have no character at all. On the contrary, an observing eye sees in these young creatures the signs of what they are likely to be, for life.

When I see a boy in haste to spend every penny as soon as he gets it I think it a sign that he will be a spendthrift.

When I see a boy hoarding up his pennies, and unwilling to part with them for any good purpose, I think it a sign that he will be a miser.

When I see a boy or girl always looking out for him or herself, and disliking to share good things with [illegible] I think it a sign that the child will grow up a very selfish person.

When I see boys and girls often quarreling I think it a sign that they will be violent and hateful men and women.

When I see a little boy willing to taste strong drink I think it a sign that he will be a drunkard.

When I see a boy who never attends to the [illegible] of religion, I think it a sign that he will be a [illegible] gate man.

When I see a [illegible] I think it a sign of great future [illegible]

And though good [illegible] character, yet as a [illegible] these signs do not fail.—*Juvenile* [illegible]

[illegible] a [illegible] gives a deposit [illegible] a few days [illegible] glasses [illegible] If examined by a microscope [illegible] able change. First of all it is converted into a vegetable growth, and this is [illegible] of [illegible] that it [illegible] other [illegible]

CHEERFULNESS.—Try [illegible] preserve yourself in an easy and cheerful [illegible] Be for the day instead of a fire-worshipper [illegible] the sun-worshipper of clear self-possession, and compare the day in which you have rolled out the [illegible] satisfaction, with that on which you have [illegible] grow up—and you will find your heart open to every good motive, your life strengthened, and your [illegible] a panoply against every trick of fate [illegible] after it [illegible].—*Richter.*

[illegible] of life and be [illegible] conveniences and luxuries [illegible] gether and he complains that [illegible] price and quality of the article.

TANNING SKINS WITH THE FUR ON.

MR. EDITOR: You gave a receipe in the Principia not long since to tan skins with the fur or wool on, and as I have had a lot of sheep skins to tan since, with the wool on, for winter mittens I tried part of them that way, and part of them my old way, with salt and alum, and I found my old way far *very far* superior to that. The chalk process makes, poor, *very poor* leather indeed. I will give you my process, and you can publish it if you desire it. I have used it for many years and do not find any other process that I have tried as good.

Take equal parts of salt and alum pulverized as fine as possible, and after removing all flesh and fat from the flesh side of the skin, sprinkle on it about four table spoons full of the mixture, (that is two of salt and two of alum) and rub it over well with the hand to make it touch every part. Then fold it lengthwise, the flesh sides together and let it lie about a day, then turn it over and let it lie on the other side about as long, then hang it up to dry, and when nearly dry, pull or rub it soft. If the skin has been dried after the animal was skinned, the skin before tanning must be soaked and worked in water till it is well softened before putting on the salt and alum. The above quantity is for a sheep skin of middling size; smaller or longer skins will need less or more, according to the size.

Two parts of salt petre and one part alum used as above makes good leather, but I think not as good as salt and alum.

I have found the chalk process (on skins that had been dried after taking off) a very poor way to tan, with the fur on.

WRITINGS OF WILLIAM GOODELL.

For sale at the office of the Principia [illegible]

DEMOCRACY OF CHRISTIANITY, 2 Vols., $1 [illegible]

SLAVERY AND ANTI-SLAVERY (History of) [illegible] $1 [illegible]

AMERICAN SLAVE CODE, 1 Vol., $1 [illegible]

OUR NATIONAL CHARTERS

[illegible]

I. The [illegible] 1787.

II. The Articles of Confederation, 1778.

III. The Declaration of Independence, 1776.

IV. The Articles of Association, 1774.

[illegible]

Spooner's Unconstitutionality of Slavery

[illegible]